



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/732,847

12/09/2003

John G. Gribben

WYS-02002

9329

25181

7590

03/22/2007

FOLEY HOAG, LLP

PATENT GROUP, WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST

155 SEAPORT BLVD

BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

GAMBEL, PHILLIP

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1644

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
----------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

31 DAYS

03/22/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/732,847

Applicant(s)

GRIBBEN ET AL.

Examiner

Phillip Gambel

Art Unit

1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5,6 and 10-14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-8 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1644

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election with traverse of the anti-B7-2 antibody as the second agent / blocking molecule and diabetes as the autoimmune disease in the Reply to Restriction Requirement, filed 12/27/06, is acknowledged.

The traversal is on the ground(s) that no undue burden would be required to search the encompassed species. This is not found persuasive for the reasons of record set forth in the Election of Species Requirement, mailed 9/21/06.

With respect to the second agent, the various species of "blocking molecule which binds to B7-1, B7-2 or CD28" as well as IL-2/IL-2 receptor (e.g., see claim 6) are distinct because their structures and modes of action are different, which require non-coextensive searches. It is noted that these "blocking molecules" do not share a substantial structural feature essential to a common utility.

Therefore, they are patentably distinct.

With respect to the targeted diseases, disorders or conditions, these species are distinct because their etiologies and therapeutic endpoints are different. Therefore, they are separate and patentably distinct species issues in determining patentability.

Further, the inventions require non-coextensive searches whether or not the classifications alone are coextensive.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of the other invention.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 1-14 are pending.

Claims 1-4 and 7-8 read on the elected species.

Claims 5-6 and 9-13 have been withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 C.F.R. 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species.

Art Unit: 1644

2. As noted previously for examination purposes, the "agent which stimulates a CTLA4-associated apoptotic signal in a T cell" as recited in claims 1, 10 and 13 reads on anti-CTLA4 antibodies.

If claims to "agents that are structurally distinct from anti-CTLA4 antibodies" are intended or presented during the course of prosecution, particularly those "agents" that do not share a substantial structural feature essential to a common utility are presented, then such "agents" will be subject to a restriction requirement.

Applicant is invited to amend the claims, particularly independent claim 1 accordingly.

3. In addition to the election of species of record and addressed above, this application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed elected Invention:

- A) wherein an autoantigen is not administered to the subject OR
- B) wherein an autoantigen is administered to the subject (See claim 8).

The methods rely upon different ingredients, process steps and endpoints. Providing an autoantigen in addition to antagonistic antibodies provides another ingredient (i.e., autoantigen), which is distinct because its/their structure(s) and modes of action are different, which require non-coextensive searches. It is noted that these "autoantigen(s)" do not share a substantial structural feature essential to a common utility with anti-CTLA-4 antibodies or anti-B7-2 antibodies.

Therefore, they are patentably distinct.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

4. Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. M.P.E.P. § 809.02(a).

Art Unit: 1644

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of the other invention.

5. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(h).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phillip Gambel whose telephone number is (571) 272-0844. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30 am to 6:00 pm. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on (571) 272-0841.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Phillip Gambel, Ph.D., J.D.
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 1600
March 19, 2007